

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 13, 15 - 23 and 25 - 32 are presently pending in the application. Claims 4, 14 and 24 were previously canceled. New claim 32 has been added. As it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their previously presented form, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

On page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 - 2, 5 - 12, 15 - 22 and 25 -31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,997 to Scott ("SCOTT") in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0109228 to Muller et al ("MULLER"). On page 12 of the Office Action, claims 3, 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over SCOTT, in view of MULLER, and further in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141478 to Ozluturk ("OZLUTURK").

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections. More particularly, the combination of prior art, cited in the Office Action, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' particularly claimed invention.

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 31 recite, among other limitations:

a transmitter of said base station being configured to transmit first data bursts to said mobile stations, at least some of the first data bursts containing at least two data blocks intended for different ones of said mobile stations, **said transmitter being configured to produce identification information for said piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of each of the first data bursts;**  
[emphasis added by Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 11 requires, among other limitations:

**first data bursts** transmitted from the base station to the mobile stations, with at least some of said first data burst containing at least two data blocks, each of said data blocks being intended for different mobile stations, and further **containing identification information for the piconetwork only at a start of each of said first data bursts;** [emphasis added by Applicants]

Applicants' independent claim 21 recites, among other limitations:

(a) **transmitting a first data burst** from the base station to the mobile stations, the first data burst containing at least two data blocks each intended for a different one of the mobile stations, **including transmitting identification information for the piconetwork only at a start of a transmission of the first data burst;** [emphasis added by Applicants]

As such, all of Applicants' claims require, among other limitations, **transmission of a first data burst including**

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

identification information for the piconetwork only at the start of the transmission of the first data burst.

Page 4 of the Office Action acknowledges that the **SCOTT** reference fails to teach or suggest the above-limitations of Applicants' claims, stating, in part:

However, Scott does not specifically disclose piconet and that the identification information is placed only at the start of the data burst.

Rather, page 4 of the Office Action goes on to point to **MULLER** as allegedly disclosing a piconet and identification information being placed only at the start of the data burst. However, Applicants respectfully disagree that the **SCOTT** and **MULLER** references can be properly combined to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Rather, the **SCOTT** and **MULLER** references cannot be combined to show Applicants' claimed invention without impermissibly destroying the teachings of those references.

More particularly, page 4 of the Office Action pointed to the Access Code of Fig. 3 of **MULLER**, and paragraphs [0008] and [0009] of **MULLER**, as allegedly disclosing identification information being placed only at the start of the data burst. Paragraphs [0008] and [0009] of **MULLER**, state:

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

Referring to FIG. 3, a typical radio packet 30 is illustrated. The radio packet has a start 32 and contains three distinct portions: a first portion contains an Access Code 34, a second portion contains a Header 36 and a third portion contains a Payload 38.

The Access Code is a series of symbols used in the network to identify the start of a radio packet and effect synchronisation and DC estimation. It has a fixed length. **The Access Code used in normal communication is the Channel Access Code which identifies the network and is included in all packets exchanged in the piconet.** [emphasis added by Applicants]

Additionally, paragraph [0004] of **MULLER**, states, in part:

**When the master unit is performing point-to-point communication a transmitted radio packet is addressed to a particular transceiver** which replies to the master unit by transmitting a radio packet addressed to the master unit in the next available time slot. Any time misalignment between the master and a slave is corrected by adjusting the timing of the slave. [emphasis added by Applicants]

As can be seen from paragraphs [0004], [0008] and [0009] of **MULLER**, Fig. 3 of **MULLER** discloses a conventional data burst (30 of Fig. 3) including data **dedicated to one, particular transceiver** (i.e., " . . . a transmitted radio packet is addressed to **a particular transceiver** . . . "). Thus, **MULLER** fails to teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicants' claims, a "first data burst containing **at least two data blocks each intended for a different one of the mobile stations**".

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

Rather, page 4 of the Office Action points to **the base station burst 571** of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** as allegedly corresponding to Applicants' claimed first data burst containing at least two data blocks each intended for a different one of the mobile stations. However, **SCOTT** discloses that the base station burst 571 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** is made up of a plurality of individual data packets (574 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT**), each of which data packets 574 must include a preamble (577 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT**) and data dedicated to multiple mobile stations (578 of Fig 5C of **SCOTT**). See, for example, col. 20 of **SCOTT**, lines 39 - 47, which state:

During the transmission portion 571, the base station 304 transmits to a plurality of user stations 302 during a plurality of transmit time slots 574. In each transmit time slot 574, rather than sending a message directed to a single user station 302, the base station 304 sends an interleaved message 578 containing a sub-message 589 for each of the user stations 302 (or a sub-message 589 for general polling or other functions if the receive time slot is unoccupied).

See also, for example, col. 21 of **SCOTT**, lines 4 - 12, which state:

In each transmit time slot 574, preceding the interleaved message 578 is a **preamble 577**. The preamble 577 assists the user station 302 in synchronization, and may comprise a spread spectrum code. Preambles 577 appear in each transmit time slot 574 and are dispersed throughout the transmission portion 574, therefore allowing the user station 302 to support channel sounding operations useful for setting up a rake receiver (e.g., synchronization)

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

and/or selection diversity. [emphasis added by Applicants]

Clearly, as can be seen from col. 21 of SCOTT, SCOTT teaches including in each burst 571, a plurality of time slots 574, wherein preambles 577 appear in each transmit time slot 574 and are dispersed throughout the transmission portion 574.

Thus, SCOTT clearly teaches that the preambles cannot appear "only at a start of a transmission of the first data burst", as required by Applicants' claims, but rather, preambles must appear in each time slot of the data burst and are dispersed throughout the transmission portion 574 of SCOTT.

To modify SCOTT as suggested in the Office Action (i.e., to include only one preamble at the start of the data burst 571 of SCOTT) would impermissibly destroy the teachings of SCOTT requiring each time slot 574 of the burst 571 of SCOTT to include preambles 577 of SCOTT dispersed throughout the transmission portion 574 of SCOTT. As such, SCOTT not only teaches a person of ordinary skill in the art away from Applicants' claimed invention, but any modification to SCOTT that would cause it to read on Applicants' claimed invention would impermissibly destroy the teachings of SCOTT.

For the foregoing reasons, among others, the SCOTT reference cannot be modified in the manner suggested in the Office

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

Action. The **OZLUTURK** reference, cited in the Office Action in combination with **SCOTT** and **MULLER** against certain of Applicants' dependent claims, does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of the **SCOTT** and **MULLER** references. Applicants' claims are, therefore, believed to be patentable over **SCOTT**, **MULLER** and **OZLUTURK**, whether taken alone, or in combination.

Additionally, Applicants have added new claim 32 to the present application. New claim 32 depends from claim 1 and recites, among other limitations:

. . . wherein the time slot of one of the first data bursts corresponds to an integer multiple  $N$  of the time slot of one of the second data bursts,  $N$  being equal to the number of mobile stations.

Support for new claim 32 can be found in the specification of the instant application, for example, on page 19 of the instant application, lines 5 - 10, which state:

In order to make it possible to compare equation (1) with the equation (2), it is assumed that the time slot  $TBMb$  for a first data burst according to the exemplary embodiment illustrated in FIG. 3 is the same as the  $N$  times time slot  $TBMa$ .

In the present application,  $TBMa$  corresponds to the time slot of the first data burst, while  $TBMb$  corresponds to the time slot of the second data burst. See, for example, page 15 of the instant application, lines 17 - 22.

Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

As stated above, page 4 of the Office Action analogizes the basestation burst 571 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** to Applicants' particularly claimed first data burst and mobile bursts 572 of Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** to Applicants' particularly claimed second data burst. However, it can be seen from Fig. 5C of **SCOTT** that the time slot of the burst 571 of **SCOTT** does not correspond to an integer multiple of the time slot of the burst 572 of **SCOTT**, as required by Applicants' new claim 32. Rather, from Fig. 5C of **SCOTT**, it can be seen that the time slot of data burst 572 of **SCOTT** (the second data burst) is greater than the time slot of the data burst 571 of **SCOTT** (the first data burst), due to additional gap times between the data packets 575 of the mobile bursts 572 of **SCOTT**. As such, Applicants' new claim 32 is believed to be further patentable over the prior art references cited in the Office Action.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, 21, 31 and 32. Claims 1, 11, , 31 and 32 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1, 11 or 21.



Applic. No. 10/629,948  
Response Dated August 29, 2008  
Responsive to Office Action of June 25, 2008

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**AUG 29 2008**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of  
claims 1 - 3, 5 - 13, 15 - 23 and 25 - 32 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims  
to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a  
telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can  
be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition  
for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to  
Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner  
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For Applicants

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

August 29, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101